



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/766,976

01/29/2004

Peng Chang

SAR-14948

4351

58882 7590 03/05/2009
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER P.C.
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE
ROSELAND, NJ 07068

EXAMINER

LE, BRIAN Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/05/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10766976	1/29/04	CHANG ET AL.	SAR-14948

PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER P.C.
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE
ROSELAND, NJ 07068

EXAMINER

BRIAN Q. LE

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2624	20090227
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Amendment and Response filed 02/10/2009 by the Appellant is considered. However, it is denied because of the following:

1. The amendments to the claims do not overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections advanced in the Examiner's Answer because 1) the step of using an "image device" to capture imagery of a scene is associated with insignificant pre-processing, and does not serve to tie the process to a particular machine, and 2) the "depth map generator" is not claimed to include any particular structural/hardware element, and may be implemented in terms of software alone, and thus does not serve to tie the process to a particular machine. Further, the process does not recite a qualifying data "transformation" because there is no output, or "depiction" of modified data commensurate with In re Abele as describe by the In re Bilski court.
2. The amendments adds additional limitations such as "each pixel in the depth map has associated 3D position data" and "based on said 3D position data", which are not related to the overcoming of the 35 U.S.C. 101's rejection and which were not the subject of the original Appeal.

/Brian P. Werner/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624